

REMARKS

The present Amendment cancels claims 1-12 and adds new claims 13 and 14. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 13 and 14.

Applicants note that the Examiner considered the July 20, 2004 Information Disclosure Statement. However, it appears that the Examiner did not consider the June 8, 2001 Information Disclosure Statement filed on along with the application on June 8, 2001. A copy of said Information Disclosure Statement is attached along with the copy of the reference cited therein. An indication that this Information Disclosure Statement has been considered is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 5-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by Natarajan (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,502) in view of Garg (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0052087); and claims 2-4, 8, 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Natarajan in view of Garg and Cox (U.S. Patent No. 5,535,335). As indicated above, claims 1-12 were canceled. Therefore, these rejections are rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

It should be noted that the cancellation of claims 1-12 was not intended nor should it be considered as an agreement on Applicants part that the features recited in claims 1-12 are taught or suggested by Natarajan, Garg or Cox whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. The cancellation of claims 1-12 was simply intended to expedite prosecution of the present application.

As indicated above, new claims 13 and 14 were added. New claims 13 and 14 are directed to a method and apparatus for identifying a computer system. According to the present invention, identification information including a plurality of identification items for identifying an identification target computer system is acquired and the identification items of the acquired identification information are compared to identification items of identification information of identification target computer systems registered in advance. Thereafter, weighting values each representing a difference between an identification item of the acquired identification information and a corresponding identification item of the identification information of the identification target computer systems are added to obtained sum value. The weighting values are defined for the identification items respectively. A judgment is performed based upon the sum value and a predetermined threshold value so as to determine whether the identification target computer system can be identified. Finally, it is concluded that the identification target computer system can be identified when the sum value is smaller than the threshold value or cannot be identified when the sum value is not smaller than the threshold value.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Natarajan, Garg or Cox whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Natarajan teaches a technique for providing automatic first event notification of changing network conditions to network elements in an adapted data feedback network. Thus, the system taught by Natarajan is particularly directed to providing

automatic notifications of network conditions to other elements in the network. Therefore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Natarajan of apparatus which is intended to identify a computer system based upon weighting values which are defined relative to identification items of identification information of computers to be identified as in the present invention.

Further, Natarajan teaches, for example, in col. 8, lines 8-31 apparatus which calculates control information for effecting the operation of the network and that such control information is collected by each of the network elements and used to determine control actions to be applied to the network element. Such features as taught by Natarajan clearly do not anticipate nor render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims regarding the identification of a computer system using weighting values which are defined with respect to various identification items of acquitted identification information according to the present invention.

Therefore, Natarajan fails to teach or suggest acquiring identification information including a plurality of identification items of an identification target computer system as recited in the claims.

Further, Natarajan fails to teach or suggest comparing the identification items of the acquired identification information to identification items of identification information of identification target computer systems registered in advance as recited in the claims.

Still further, Natarajan fails to teach or suggest adding weighting values each representing a difference between an identification item of the acquired identification

information and a corresponding identification item of the identification information of the identification target computer systems to obtain a sum value, wherein the weighting values are defined for the identification items respectively as recited in the claims.

Still further yet, Natarajan fails to teach or suggest judging, based on the sum value and a predetermined threshold value, whether the identification target computer can be identified, concluding that the identification target computer system can be identified when the sum value is smaller than a threshold and concluding that the identification target computer cannot be identified when the sum value is not smaller than the threshold value as recited in the claims.

The above noted deficiencies of Natarajan are not supplied by Garg or Cox whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

Garg simply teaches in paragraph [0050] thereof apparatus which reduces storage space by identifying data collected during a term and Cox teaches in col. 7, lines 1-14 and col. 8, lines 15-59 apparatus which calculates a ratio or percentage of the number or real resources among collected resources against a threshold so as to determine a status of "unknown" or "known" apparatus.

The above described teachings of Garg and Cox do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above of Natarajan relative to the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Thus, based on the above, Applicants submit that whether Natarajan is taken individually or in combination with one or more of Garg or Cox, the features of the

present invention as recited in the claims are still not taught or suggested by Natarajan, Garg or Cox whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-12.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 13 and 14 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 13 and 14 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.40197X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120